DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 906 HE 025 829

AUTHOR Narang, Harbans
TITLE Evaluating Faculty Teaching: A Proposal.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; *College Faculty; *College Instruction; Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Evaluation; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Peer Evaluation; Program Development; Records (Forms); Standards; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an approach to the evaluation of college faculty teaching which stresses input from students, colleagues, the department head, and the faculty member under review. Evaluation guidelines suggest that evaluation criteria and the measurement process, as well as the instruments used for measuring teacher performance, be jointly approved and accepted by faculty, the department head, and the dean. In addition, data should be interpreted in relation to valid norms or standards. Finally, the roles of each of the major contributors to an evaluation is discussed. Appendices contain a list of 10 items for student ratings, a rating sheet designed for teaching materials and procedures appraisal, a classroom visitation appraisal sheet, and a self-report of teaching sheet. Contains 12 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349906

EVALUATING FACULTY TEACHING:

A PROPOSAL

Harbans Narang

Faculty of Education

University of Regina

HE 025 889

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Harbans Narang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:

A PROPOSAL

Introduction

Teaching is one of the major activities of the university faculty. A recent report by Smith (1991) has renewed universities' interest in evaluating teaching effectiveness. Collective agreements between faculty associations and university administrations also point out the importance of teaching in the annual performance review of individual faculty members. Much has been written on this topic. See for example, Centra (1979, 1990), Murray (1980), Seldin (1980), Braskamp et al (1984), Roe and McDonald (1984), Aleamani (1987), and Miller (1987). These authors have discussed issues such as the nature and scope of faculty teaching, criteria for evaluation, uses and limitations of evaluation, and the types of instruments to be used. The purpose of this paper is to present a practical and meaningful approach to the evaluation of faculty teaching.

Evaluation Plan

Teaching is a complex activity. Teachers have to organize the course content, plan for instruction, create an appropriate learning environment, engage in the teaching act, provide out-of-class help to students, and assess student performance. An initial key step, therefore, is to identify the dimensions of teaching that should be included in an evaluation plan. Such a plan could include course and instructor-related aspects such as the following:

Course-Related

1. Course organization/structure
2. Assignments and instructional materials
3. Marking and grading practices and procedures
4. Workload and difficulty level
5. Outcomes of instruction

Instructor-Related

1. Mastery of the subject matter
2. Communication skills
3. Concerns for students

Centra (1977), mentions fifteen different methods of collecting data on these and other aspects of teaching. These methods require the involvement of students, colleagues, alumni, departmental chairperson, and the Dean. Self-reports by faculty members are additional sources of data. This author recommends that, for practical purposes, the major contributions should be from students, colleagues, Department Head, and the faculty member under review.

Guidelines for Evaluation

Since evaluation of teaching done at many universities is subjective and often unsystematic, the following guidelines are proposed as a part of an evaluation plan:

1. The criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions be developed jointly by the faculty, Department Head, and the Dean.
2. The instruments to be used be acceptable to the faculty, the Department Head, and the Dean.

3. Data from all appropriate sources be obtained over more than two semesters in order to get a comprehensive picture of an instructor's teaching.
4. Data be collected from both students and colleagues. Additional data from other sources such as alumni and self reports may also be used if such data are collected appropriately and systematically.
5. Norms or standards be available to make meaningful interpretation of the data.

Role of the Contributors

According to the above guidelines, the major contributors in an evaluation plan are: (i) students, (ii) colleagues, (iii) Department Head and (iv) the individual faculty member. The role of the Dean is to ensure that the procedures are clearly spelled out and systematically followed to assist him/her in making decisions which are fair. The roles of major contributors are described below:

Students:

Student ratings, if to be used for personnel decisions, should be based on a few items which could apply to all courses. Many examples of instruments are available in the literature. This writer has used ten items to be rated by students on a four-point scale as shown in Appendix A. Murray (1987) has provided a sixty-item teacher behavior inventory that can be used for diagnostic purposes to improve instruction. This writer has developed a Student Ratings Form which is divided into two parts. Part I consists of thirty-five items for Course

Evaluation and Part II consists of fifteen items for Instructor Evaluation.

Colleagues

Cohen and McKeachie (1980) have discussed the role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching. Two ways in which colleagues provide evaluations are by (i) examining the course materials in terms of program goals, currency, and appropriateness of the content, and (ii) class visitations to obtain first-hand data on aspects of course delivery. Videotaping of classroom teaching can also be used as a substitute for actual visitation. Two sample forms, one for Teaching Materials and Procedures Appraisal , and the other for Classroom Visitation Appraisal are included in Appendix B for illustration.

Weimer (1988) has identified ten caveats for classroom observations by colleagues and discusses ways to compensate for and overcome potential problems in this area. A major concern is the selection of colleagues for this purpose. Since their evaluation carries a lot of weight, colleagues should be acceptable to the faculty member being evaluated, the Department Head, and the Dean. A team of two, one nominated by the Dean or Department Head and the other by the faculty member under review might be able to carry out the evaluation.

Department Head

The role of the Department Head is to ensure that all relevant data on teaching were collected appropriately and were analyzed objectively.

The Department Head should establish norms or standards in consultation with the Dean and the Peer Review Committee or the faculty at large so that there is consistency in interpreting the data. In making a recommendation the Department Head may also consider the enrollment patterns and grade distributions if these have relevance in the interpretation of the data on faculty teaching. This, too, should be carefully documented as recommended by Centra and Associates (1990).

Individual Self-Report

Every faculty member should document class-related activities that, in his/her judgment, have contributed to teaching effectiveness and should also prepare a self-appraisal. A form for such an appraisal is attached in Appendix C.

Concluding Statement

Teaching is a multi-dimensional activity,therefore its evaluation should cover all aspects of teaching. The procedures for data collection and interpretation should be clear and be developed by and agreed to by the faculty, Department Head, and the Dean.

References

Aleamani, Lawrence M. (1987). Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Braskamp, Larry A. et al. (1984). Evaluating teaching effectiveness Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.

Centra, John A. (1977). How universities evaluate faculty performance. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Centra, John A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Centra, John A. (1990). A guide to evaluating teaching for promotion and tenure. Littleton, MS: Copley Publishing Group.

Cohen, Peter A. and McKeachie, Wilbert J. (1980). "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching". Improving college and university teaching, 28, 147-54.

Miller, Richard I. (1987). Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, Harry G. (1980). Evaluating university teaching. Toronto: Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations.

Murray, Harry G. (1987). "Acquiring Student Feedback That Improves Instruction". In M.G. Weiner (ed.) Teaching large classes well. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 32. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roe, E. and McDonald L. (1984). Informed professional judgement. St. Lucia, NY: University of Queensland Press.

Smith, Stuart L. (1991). Report: commission of inquiry in canadian university education. Ottawa: AUCC.

Weimer, Maryellen G. et al. (1988). "Instructional Observation: Caveats, Concerns, and Ways to Compensate". Studies in higher education, 13, 299-307.

APPENDIX A

Student Ratings

Class Title: _____ Instructor: _____

Class No: _____ Date: _____

Please read the following statements carefully and indicate your response by circling the appropriate symbol in each case. The explanation for the symbols is as follows:

SA - Strongly Agree; A - Agree; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree

1.	The instructor made the course objectives clear.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	The instructor encouraged students to ask questions and share their thoughts.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	The instructor was well organized.	SA	A	D	SD
5.	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of his/her subject matter.	SA	A	D	SD
6.	Generally the instructional materials were helpful	SA	A	D	SD
7.	The assignments required were useful.	SA	A	D	SD
8.	The criteria for evaluation were explained.	SA	A	D	SD
9.	The instructor was willing to help students.	SA	A	D	SD

10.	Overall, I would rate this instructor as (circle one)
	Excellent Good Satisfactory Fair Poor

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

Teaching Materials and Procedures Appraisal

Instructor: _____ Course(s) 1. _____

Term: _____ 2. _____

Appraisor: _____ 3. _____

Directions: Sevens items are listed below. You may add one or two more items. Rate each item on the scale by circling your response and make sure to complete the composite rating.

		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1.	Does the course outline reflect important objectives of the course?	1	2	3	4
2.	Do the teaching materials (handouts, reading lists, etc.) include practical or current views in the field?	1	2	3	4
3.	Do the assignments show important learning outcomes?	1	2	3	4
4.	Do the examinations cover important aspects of the subject matter?	1	2	3	4
5.	Do examples of completed assignments and written examinations suggest a fair marking/grading system?	1	2	3	4
6.	What is the quality of new or upgraded materials that the instructor has prepared as a result of feedback about his/her teaching?	1	2	3	4
7.	How do you rate teaching-related activities of this instructor (i.e. course design, consultation, outside lectures and workshops)?	1	2	3	4
8.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
9.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				

10. Composite Rating _____

Classroom Visitaion Appraisal

Instructor: _____ Course: _____ Term: _____

Appraisor: _____ Date: _____

Directions: Seven items are list below. You may add one or two more items. Rate each item on the scale by circling an apporpriate number. Be sure to complete the composite rating.

		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1.	Was the major objective of the lesson made clear?	1	2	3	4
2.	Was the instructor prepared and organized?	1	2	3	4
3.	Were the ideas clearly presented and explained?	1	2	3	4
4.	How did the instructor handle student questions and viewpoints?	1	2	3	4
5.	How would you rate the instructor-student rapport?	1	2	3	4
6.	Did the instructor stress/review the important points of the lesson?	1	2	3	4
7.	Was the major objective achieved?	1	2	3	4
8.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
9.	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____				
10.		Composite Score _____			

APPENDIX C

Self-Report of Teaching

Instructor: _____ Date: _____

1. List things that you have done different from last year to improve your teaching.

2. List conferences/sessions/workshops related specifically to teaching in higher education that you have attended in the last two years.

3. List workshops given or papers written on teaching and learning in higher education.

4. List workshops/lectures that you have given to classes other than your own.

5. List a recent article or a book that has influenced your teaching style/approach.

6. Rate your instructional effectiveness. (circle one)

   Poor Fair Satisfactory Good Excellent